The 1991 Partition That Never Was: A Counterfactual Analysis of Russia Retaining Eastern Ukraine

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

February 3, 2026

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 unleashed a cascade of political reconfigurations, but few were as consequential—or as contested—as the borders of post-Soviet Ukraine. In the real timeline, Ukraine emerged with full sovereignty over Crimea and its eastern industrial heartland, despite their majority Russian-speaking populations and deep historic ties to Moscow. This paper explores a plausible counterfactual: What if Russia had retained Crimea and the predominantly Russian-speaking regions of eastern Ukraine at the moment of Soviet dissolution? Rather than examining the 2014 annexation of Crimea or the 2022 invasion of Ukraine as abrupt anomalies, this alternate history reframes them as preventable aftershocks of a flawed geopolitical compromise. We ask how the 1991 map could have been drawn differently, what strategic advantages and diplomatic crises may have followed, and whether the resulting world would have been more stable or more dangerous. This analysis offers not just an imaginative rethinking of history, but a lens through which to understand present tensions and future fault lines. The past, as we show, was never as inevitable as it seemed.

Keywords: Russia, Ukraine, Crimea, Donbas, Soviet Union, post-Soviet borders, counterfactual history, NATO, Cold War, Eurasian geopolitics, partition, Russian-speaking regions, 1991 USSR collapse, hybrid warfare, NATO expansion.

A collaboration with GPT-4o. CC4.0.

Outline:

1. Introduction: Rethinking the 1991 Map
1.1 The legacy of Soviet cartography
1.2 Why counterfactual history matters
1.3 Scope of analysis: regions and scenarios

2. Demographics and Identity in Eastern Ukraine (1991)
2.1 Linguistic and cultural alignment with Russia
2.2 Crimea's special status and Sevastopol naval base
2.3 Donbas, Kharkiv, and industrial loyalty to Moscow

3. The Missed Partition: Why It Didn't Happen
3.1 Internal Ukrainian resistance and the myth of unity
3.2 Russian political instability and strategic ambiguity
3.3 Western reluctance to support border changes

4. Immediate Consequences of a 1991 Partition
4.1 Truncated Ukraine: smaller, more Western-oriented
4.2 Stabilized Russian influence in the Black Sea
4.3 Economic realignment and identity consolidation in both states

5. Geopolitical Trajectories: East vs. West, Recalibrated
5.1 NATO expansion without a frozen conflict
5.2 Russia's repositioning as Eurasian buffer state
5.3 The missed Maidan: no 2014, no 2022

6. International Law, Recognition, and the Question of Precedent
6.1 Could such a partition have been legally formalized?
6.2 Global norms and the specter of irredentism
6.3 Kaliningrad vs. Crimea: drawing analogies

7. Strategic Gains vs. Moral Costs
7.1 Would peace have endured under de facto imperial lines?
7.2 Propaganda, soft power, and the new Cold Peace
7.3 Risk of long-term insurgency or cultural repression

8. A More Stable Post-Soviet Order?
8.1 Partition as prevention: what conflict was avoided
8.2 Partition as provocation: what tensions remain
8.3 Evaluating alternate peace: better, worse, or just different?

9. Conclusion: History as Design Space
9.1 The contingency of national borders
9.2 Learning from unrealized scenarios
9.3 Implications for future border conflicts

10. References

Art

1. Introduction: Rethinking the 1991 Map

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 marked one of the most dramatic geopolitical shifts of the 20th century, producing fifteen newly independent states and redrawing the political map of Eurasia overnight. Among the most fragile of these emergent borders was that of Ukraine, a nation whose territorial integrity concealed deep ethnic, linguistic, and cultural divisions—most notably between its Ukrainian-speaking west and Russian-speaking east. Yet at the time, few questioned the post-Soviet borders handed down by internal Soviet administrative lines, now elevated to the status of international frontiers. In retrospect, the decision to maintain Ukraine's Soviet-era boundaries may have been less an affirmation of sovereignty than a geopolitical expedient—one that stored future conflict like a fault line under pressure.

This paper reconsiders that moment through the lens of counterfactual history: What if, in 1991, Russia had retained only the Russian-speaking parts of Ukraine, such as Crimea, Donbas, and parts of Kharkiv and Odesa? Far from a speculative fantasy, this scenario invites serious reflection on how a modest alteration in the initial post-Soviet border settlement might have changed the trajectory of Eurasian geopolitics and potentially prevented decades of conflict.

1.1 The Legacy of Soviet Cartography

The internal administrative boundaries of the USSR were never intended to function as sovereign borders. They were drawn, often arbitrarily, to serve economic planning, ethnic balance, or political control within a unitary state governed from Moscow. Soviet cartographers and bureaucrats routinely adjusted borders for reasons that had little to do with national self-determination. Crimea, for example, was transferred from the Russian SFSR to the Ukrainian SSR in 1954—a symbolic gesture under Khrushchev with no anticipation of future independence movements.

As a result, the Soviet collapse elevated these artificial lines into the basis of international law. This transformation bestowed sudden sovereignty on composite entities like Ukraine, where a significant portion of the population in the east and south remained deeply Russian in language, culture, and geopolitical orientation. Thus, the map of 1991 was not the product of historical justice or democratic will, but rather a legacy artifact from a dissolved empire.

1.2 Why Counterfactual History Matters

Counterfactual history is not mere fiction. It is a rigorous analytical tool for testing causal assumptions, clarifying decision points, and evaluating the fragility of historical outcomes. In this case, imagining a partitioned Ukraine at the time of the USSR's collapse enables us to ask:

Were the later conflicts in Crimea and Donbas inevitable? Or were they contingent on missed decisions at the foundational moment of independence?

By exploring a scenario in which Russia retains only the Russian-speaking regions of Ukraine, we challenge the prevailing narrative that the post-Soviet order was fixed and unavoidable. This method does not aim to romanticize Russian expansionism or diminish Ukrainian agency. Rather, it probes whether an alternate configuration could have led to greater regional stability, fewer wars, and a more durable geopolitical equilibrium.

1.3 Scope of Analysis: Regions and Scenarios

This paper limits its counterfactual exploration to the hypothetical retention by Russia of select territories within Ukraine that were predominantly Russian-speaking in 1991. These include Crimea, the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of the Donbas region, and possibly parts of Kharkiv, Zaporizhzhia, and Odesa. We do not consider broader neo-imperial fantasies of resurrecting the Soviet Union, nor do we include other former Soviet states such as Belarus or Kazakhstan. Likewise, we exclude speculative annexations outside the former USSR, such as Serbia or Hungary, which fall beyond the historical and logistical plausibility of the scenario.

The paper analyzes how such a partition could have occurred—whether via negotiated separation, unilateral declaration, or post-Soviet federal realignment—and examines the likely consequences for Ukraine, Russia, NATO, and the broader international system. Through this focused lens, we aim to illuminate how a single change in the post-Cold War transition could have reshaped the next three decades of Eurasian history.

2. Demographics and Identity in Eastern Ukraine (1991)

When Ukraine declared independence in 1991, it did so as a territorially intact entity largely shaped by its Soviet past rather than by a unified national identity. The eastern and southern regions of Ukraine—particularly Crimea, Donbas, Kharkiv, and parts of Odesa and Zaporizhzhia—stood in stark contrast to the nationalistic fervor of the western oblasts. The former were deeply intertwined with Russian linguistic, cultural, economic, and historical traditions. These divisions were not superficial. They represented genuine cleavages in worldview, loyalty, and political aspiration.

Although the national independence referendum that year received majority support even in these Russian-speaking regions, the vote was likely shaped more by economic uncertainty, hope for a better future, and disillusionment with central Soviet authority than by any strong desire to build a distinctly Ukrainian civic nation. The identity landscape of Ukraine in 1991 was

layered, complex, and in many areas, far more aligned with Moscow than with Lviv or Kyiv. This fragmentation was a warning sign—one ignored by most policymakers, both Ukrainian and foreign.

2.1 Linguistic and Cultural Alignment with Russia

In 1991, the eastern and southern parts of Ukraine were overwhelmingly Russian-speaking. Russian was the dominant language in everyday life, government affairs, education, media, and business. In cities like Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, and Odesa, Ukrainian was either a secondary language or, in some circles, nearly absent. For many in these areas, Russia was not a foreign country but a cultural homeland—often one of familial origin or shared historical memory.

This linguistic divide was more than just a matter of vocabulary or dialect; it was an axis of cultural identification. Russian-speaking Ukrainians in the east consumed Russian literature, watched Russian television, followed Russian politics, and often viewed Moscow—not Kyiv—as the heart of their cultural universe. Soviet identity persisted as a unifying concept, and for many, the distinction between being "Russian" and "Ukrainian" felt artificial or even imposed. This sentiment did not automatically equate to political separatism, but it did create a latent alignment with Russia that would become geopolitically relevant in future decades.

2.2 Crimea’s Special Status and Sevastopol Naval Base

Nowhere was the Russian alignment more pronounced than in Crimea. The peninsula had been part of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic until 1954, when it was transferred to the Ukrainian SSR in a largely symbolic gesture by Nikita Khrushchev. This administrative move had little practical effect under Soviet centralization, but it became a flashpoint the moment the USSR collapsed.

By 1991, Crimea’s population was overwhelmingly Russian in language and identity. Ethnic Russians comprised a majority, and pro-Russian sentiment was widespread. The Crimean parliament voted for greater autonomy even before Ukrainian independence and later declared conditional allegiance to Ukraine.

Sevastopol, home to the Black Sea Fleet, held critical military and strategic value for Russia. The naval base served as Russia's only warm-water outlet to the Mediterranean and was deeply embedded in its maritime doctrine. Unlike Crimea as a whole, Sevastopol had a special administrative status within the USSR and was governed directly from Moscow. After 1991, the base became a site of tension, with Russian and Ukrainian forces co-located in uneasy

coexistence. Had Russia insisted on retaining Sevastopol—or all of Crimea—at the outset, it would have been on firm cultural and strategic ground, at least from its own perspective.

2.3 Donbas, Kharkiv, and Industrial Loyalty to Moscow

The Donbas region—comprising Donetsk and Luhansk—was Ukraine's industrial heartland, rich in coal, steel, and heavy manufacturing. It had been a flagship of Soviet economic pride and benefited from direct investment from Moscow for decades. The population was largely urbanized, heavily Russified, and deeply embedded in Soviet identity. Russian language use in Donbas was nearly universal, and many families had roots across the border in Russia.

Kharkiv, Ukraine's second-largest city and former capital, shared a similar profile. It was an intellectual and technological center, with strong industrial ties to Moscow and St. Petersburg. The city hosted major defense and aerospace industries, many of which were integrated into the Soviet military-industrial complex. While Kharkiv had a more mixed ethnic composition than Donbas, its orientation—linguistically, economically, and culturally—was eastward.

These regions often viewed Kyiv's authority as distant and alien. Their loyalty to the central Ukrainian government was transactional at best, and their deeper allegiance remained with the system that had nurtured their development: the Soviet Union, and by extension, Russia. In this light, the incorporation of Donbas and Kharkiv into an independent Ukrainian state in 1991 represented not a natural evolution, but a geopolitical imposition—one that Russia, in a different scenario, could have chosen to challenge immediately.

3. The Missed Partition: Why It Didn't Happen

The Soviet Union's disintegration in 1991 presented a brief but decisive window during which new national borders could have been drawn based on linguistic, cultural, and historical coherence. Yet, the map that emerged largely respected the internal boundaries of Soviet republics rather than redrawing them according to local demographics or political will. Ukraine, in particular, emerged as a fully intact state, including Crimea and the entire eastern industrial corridor—despite the deep-rooted Russian identity of many of its regions. In hindsight, this choice carried heavy geopolitical consequences. Why did no partition occur at the moment of collapse? The answer lies in a convergence of domestic Ukrainian assertiveness, Russian disarray, and international pressures to preserve the status quo.

3.1 Internal Ukrainian Resistance and the Myth of Unity

At the moment of independence, Ukraine projected a vision of unity that, while aspirational, masked internal fractures. The 1991 Ukrainian independence referendum showed overwhelming support across all regions—including Crimea and Donbas. Even in the most pro-Russian oblasts, over 50% of voters backed secession from the USSR. This outcome created the appearance of national consensus and was swiftly interpreted as a popular mandate for a unified Ukrainian state.

But this unity was brittle. Support for independence was often driven by frustration with economic decline, fear of being left behind by Moscow's unraveling, and the hope of a more stable future—not necessarily out of nationalistic alignment with the idea of a Ukrainian civic nation. Nevertheless, Kyiv seized the momentum to solidify its control over the entire republic, rapidly building national institutions and suppressing regional autonomy movements. The government sought to rewrite the post-Soviet narrative as one of inevitable Ukrainian wholeness, sidelining voices from the east and south that questioned this framework. In this climate, any formal partition—no matter how culturally justified—was seen as a betrayal of national destiny.

3.2 Russian Political Instability and Strategic Ambiguity

While Ukraine was asserting itself, Russia was descending into chaos. The early 1990s were a period of profound political disorientation for Moscow. Boris Yeltsin's government faced internal power struggles, economic collapse, and a crisis of identity. The Russian Federation was focused on consolidating itself, avoiding civil war, and navigating a painful transition to capitalism. In this context, projecting power outward—especially in the form of territorial claims—was not only impractical, it risked unraveling the fragile post-Soviet order.

Moreover, Russia's strategy toward its "near abroad" was far from coherent. On one hand, Moscow signaled a desire to maintain influence over former Soviet republics through instruments like the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). On the other, it tacitly accepted the international recognition of newly independent states within their Soviet-era borders. This strategic ambiguity stemmed not from ideological commitment to national sovereignty, but from weakness. Russia lacked the resources, the military cohesion, and the diplomatic bandwidth to press its case for partition. The moment to act passed before any coordinated policy could emerge.

3.3 Western Reluctance to Support Border Changes

The international community—especially the United States and Western Europe—responded to the Soviet collapse with a doctrine of rapid recognition and territorial preservation. Western leaders feared that reopening borders in the post-Soviet space would trigger a cascade of ethnic conflicts, border wars, and political fragmentation. The examples of Yugoslavia and the Caucasus were already raising alarms. To avoid a wider bloodbath, the West adopted a pragmatic principle: keep the map frozen as it was in 1991.

This posture was evident in the swift recognition of Ukraine's independence—within its full Soviet boundaries—by major powers. The Budapest Memorandum of 1994, in which Russia, the US, and the UK pledged to respect Ukraine's territorial integrity in exchange for Kyiv relinquishing its nuclear arsenal, cemented this consensus. The West was unwilling to entertain any division of Ukraine, no matter how justifiable by local demographics or political desires. Behind this reluctance was a clear priority: the stabilization of Europe’s eastern frontier, even at the cost of papering over unresolved identity conflicts.

In effect, the door to a peaceful, negotiated partition—perhaps with Russian-speaking regions granted autonomy, federation, or even accession to Russia—was closed not by military force, but by diplomatic inertia. The silence of that moment would echo decades later in the roar of war.

4. Immediate Consequences of a 1991 Partition

Had Russia retained the Russian-speaking territories of Ukraine at the moment of Soviet dissolution, the geopolitical and internal trajectories of both countries would have diverged sharply from the historical path. The immediate consequences of such a partition would not have been merely territorial; they would have reshaped political identities, economic strategies, and regional alignments in profound and possibly stabilizing ways. Ukraine, though smaller, would likely have pursued a clearer Western orientation earlier. Russia, meanwhile, would have secured its strategic position in the Black Sea and eliminated a future pretext for conflict. The economic and cultural separation, though painful, might have accelerated a healthier national consolidation for both sides—averting decades of hybrid war, occupation, and contested legitimacy.

4.1 Truncated Ukraine: Smaller, More Western-Oriented

In this counterfactual scenario, Ukraine would have emerged from the Soviet collapse without the regions most resistant to Ukrainian nationalism and Western integration. A truncated

Ukraine, consisting primarily of central and western oblasts, would have been demographically more homogeneous, with fewer internal divisions over language, religion, and foreign policy. The absence of Crimea and Donbas would have dramatically reduced the political influence of pro-Russian parties, oligarchs, and Russian-leaning voters in parliament.

Without these internal contradictions, Ukraine may have pursued NATO and EU membership more quickly, facing fewer domestic obstacles and less fear of Russian retaliation. The nation-building project—centered on the Ukrainian language, a shared historical narrative, and European identity—would have advanced unimpeded. Kyiv could have focused on reforming institutions, integrating with Western markets, and aligning its defense posture with the West. The potential for a unified national story, unfractured by competing loyalties, would have strengthened political legitimacy from the outset.

4.2 Stabilized Russian Influence in the Black Sea

For Russia, the retention of Crimea and eastern Ukraine would have resolved one of its most pressing strategic anxieties: access to and control over the Black Sea. With Sevastopol firmly in Russian hands from the beginning, there would have been no need for a leasing arrangement with Ukraine, no risk of losing the port to NATO influence, and no rationale for a future military intervention. The naval balance in the region would have stabilized early, and Russia's maritime strategy could have matured without international crisis.

In addition to military assets, Crimea provided Russia with a symbolic anchor to its imperial and Soviet past. It was the site of heroic wartime narratives, Orthodox pilgrimage sites, and cultural memory. By asserting control over the peninsula at the moment of Soviet collapse, Russia would have solidified its post-Soviet identity on its own terms, rather than through revanchist tactics decades later. This early consolidation might have discouraged aggressive foreign policy moves elsewhere, allowing Russia to focus on internal stabilization rather than projecting power through destabilization.

4.3 Economic Realignment and Identity Consolidation in Both States

Partitioning Ukraine in 1991 would have carried significant economic consequences for both sides. Ukraine would have lost key industrial regions, particularly in Donbas and Kharkiv, which were central to its coal, steel, and heavy machinery sectors. This loss would have initially weakened Ukraine's economic capacity, but it might also have forced a swifter transition toward a market-based, reform-driven economy. Freed from the financial and political weight of Soviet-style industries resistant to modernization, Ukraine could have pivoted toward agriculture,

services, and information technology—sectors more aligned with Western economic integration.

For Russia, absorbing these regions would have deepened its industrial base and preserved some of the economic interdependencies of the Soviet era. However, it would also have assumed responsibility for supporting heavily subsidized industries and populations accustomed to centralized welfare structures. Managing this burden could have strained Russia's early post-Soviet economy, but in exchange, it would have gained greater domestic cohesion among populations aligned with Moscow culturally and politically.

Crucially, the partition would have allowed both Ukraine and Russia to consolidate their national identities more cleanly. Ukraine would no longer be torn between east and west, nor would Russia need to frame its foreign policy around the idea of "protecting Russians abroad." The myth of the indivisible Russian world and the counter-narrative of Ukrainian victimhood may both have lost potency, replaced by the practical work of rebuilding within more coherent national boundaries. The cost of early separation might have been high—but it could have spared both nations decades of violence, contested borders, and frozen wars.

5. Geopolitical Trajectories: East vs. West, Recalibrated

A 1991 partition of Ukraine—wherein Russia retained Crimea and the heavily Russian-speaking territories of the east—would have altered the global geopolitical chessboard from the very start of the post–Cold War era. The long, drawn-out antagonism that characterized East-West relations after 2014 might have been replaced by a more pragmatic equilibrium, where fault lines were clearer, alliances more predictable, and the chances of hot war substantially reduced. Without contested sovereignty in Crimea or the Donbas, NATO's eastern expansion would have occurred in a more decisive but less destabilizing fashion. Simultaneously, Russia would have been positioned to fortify its influence regionally without the disruptive, revisionist undertones that later defined its foreign policy. The seismic shocks of Euromaidan in 2014 and the full-scale invasion in 2022 might never have happened, not because of appeasement, but because the powder keg of contradictory territorial assumptions would have been defused before it was ever built.

5.1 NATO Expansion Without a Frozen Conflict

One of the primary barriers to Ukraine's NATO accession in the real-world timeline has been the presence of unresolved territorial disputes. From 2008 onward, NATO allies maintained that Ukraine could not be admitted while it contained frozen conflicts—first in Crimea, later in

Donetsk and Luhansk. These unresolved disputes, whether by design or inertia, served as a de facto veto against NATO membership, providing Russia with enduring leverage.

In the counterfactual scenario, a truncated Ukraine—defined and stabilized within its western and central regions—would not have inherited these time bombs. Without contested borders, its eligibility for NATO would be strengthened. Furthermore, its internal political landscape would be more unified in its Western orientation. The Alliance, recognizing a willing and strategically located partner unencumbered by civil war or separatist enclaves, might have fast-tracked Ukraine's path to membership by the early 2000s, in line with the accessions of Poland, the Baltic states, and Romania.

Such a development would have changed the psychology of NATO's eastern frontier. Rather than existing in a gray zone of strategic ambiguity, Ukraine would have become a formal part of the Western defense architecture—deterring Russian aggression by removing its plausibility.

5.2 Russia's Repositioning as Eurasian Buffer State

With its Black Sea access and ethnic kin secured through the early partition, Russia's post-Soviet identity could have evolved along more stable lines. Rather than being haunted by the loss of Crimea or the perceived betrayal of Russian-speaking Ukrainians, Russia might have embraced a vision of itself as the anchor of a pan-Eurasian buffer zone—bridging, rather than confronting, East and West.

By integrating Crimea, Donbas, and possibly Kharkiv into its federation from the outset, Russia would have eliminated the major cultural grievances it later mobilized as justifications for intervention. The Kremlin would no longer need to stage referenda, foment proxy rebellions, or deploy hybrid warfare tactics. Its sphere of influence, while still vast, would have been grounded in formal control and mutual recognition, rather than informal disruption.

This might have allowed Moscow to focus more on internal development, economic integration with Central Asia, and constructing alternative global alliances—particularly with China and Iran—without being mired in decade-long tensions over Ukraine. Russia's foreign policy would still have challenged Western dominance, but with a clearer, less destabilizing platform.

5.3 The Missed Maidan: No 2014, No 2022

The Euromaidan protests in 2014—sparked by President Yanukovych's refusal to sign an association agreement with the European Union—were the political expression of a country divided against itself. Western and central Ukrainians pushed for integration with Europe, while

many in the east and south feared economic dislocation and cultural displacement. The resulting revolution, followed by Russia's seizure of Crimea and war in Donbas, plunged Ukraine into a new era of existential struggle.

But in the 1991 partition scenario, these political fault lines would have been largely absent. A western-oriented Ukraine without Donbas and Crimea would have elected more consistently pro-European governments. There would have been no Yanukovych presidency to derail an EU agreement, and no flashpoint strong enough to trigger nationwide protest and regime change. The revolution would have been unnecessary—and therefore, nonexistent.

Likewise, without Crimea to annex or Donbas to destabilize, Russia would have had no plausible pretext for launching the 2022 full-scale invasion. Ukraine, by then a member of NATO or under a formal security guarantee, would have been protected by collective defense commitments. Even if political tensions remained, the pathway to war would have been blocked—not by appeasement, but by the early resolution of geopolitical ambiguities.

The cost of maintaining artificial unity in 1991 was enormous. The partition that never happened became the conflict that never ended. In this alternate timeline, clarity at the beginning might have yielded peace thereafter.

6. International Law, Recognition, and the Question of Precedent

A formal partition of Ukraine in 1991, in which Russia retained Crimea and other Russian-speaking regions, would have required a delicate legal and diplomatic balancing act. The global community had just witnessed the implosion of one of the most powerful states in history. There was little appetite for revisiting the fragile consensus that allowed the new international order to stabilize quickly. Yet, had Russia and Ukraine pursued a negotiated territorial adjustment—before these lands became flashpoints in future wars—the consequences might have been far less disruptive than the conflicts that later erupted. The legal plausibility of such a partition, the fears it would have raised among other nations, and the historical analogies available at the time all merit close examination.

6.1 Could Such a Partition Have Been Legally Formalized?

Yes, a legal and internationally recognized partition was possible in 1991—but it would have required political will, transparency, and formal agreement between the Russian and Ukrainian governments, backed by international mediators or guarantors. The precedent for such arrangements already existed: the peaceful separation of Czechoslovakia into the Czech

Republic and Slovakia in 1993, and the redrawing of borders during the breakup of Yugoslavia—although the latter was far bloodier and more fragmented.

For Ukraine and Russia to agree on a territorial adjustment, the process would have needed to include:

- A bilateral treaty ratified by both states' legislatures;
- International recognition through the United Nations or regional bodies such as the OSCE;
- Possibly, referenda in the contested regions, with mechanisms to prevent coercion or external interference.

Crucially, such a process would have required Kyiv to acknowledge that certain territories did not identify with the Ukrainian nation-state project—an emotionally and politically difficult admission. For Moscow, it would have required restraining nationalist sentiment and committing to peaceful negotiation rather than latent revanchism. The opportunity was narrow, but not unimaginable. The problem was not legal impossibility, but political paralysis.

6.2 Global Norms and the Specter of Irredentism

The greatest obstacle to any partition in 1991 was not local sentiment, but the fear in Western capitals that redrawing borders—no matter how justified by demographics—would unleash a wave of irredentist claims across the post-Soviet and post-colonial world. International norms after World War II emphasized the sanctity of existing borders, no matter how artificial, over the risks of reopening them. The logic was clear: if borders could be renegotiated every time an ethnic or linguistic majority existed across a boundary, the modern international system would fracture under the weight of endless territorial demands.

This norm was particularly salient in the former Soviet space, where many republics had multiethnic populations with overlapping historical claims. Supporting a Russian claim to Crimea or Donbas in 1991—even if done peacefully—might have encouraged:

- Romania to seek parts of Moldova;
- Hungary to press for Transcarpathia;
- Armenia and Azerbaijan to escalate their contest over Nagorno-Karabakh;
- Or even China to reopen old grievances in Central Asia.

Thus, the West's reflexive support for the territorial integrity of post-Soviet states, no matter how tenuous, was rooted in a broader desire to avoid precedent-setting fragmentation. From this view, the 1991 Ukrainian borders were less about justice than about containment of potential chaos.

6.3 Kaliningrad vs. Crimea: Drawing Analogies

The closest geographic analogy to a peaceful postwar territorial anomaly is Kaliningrad, a Russian exclave on the Baltic Sea that was part of Germany (Königsberg) before being annexed by the Soviet Union after World War II. Kaliningrad was stripped from Germany as part of the Allied settlement and remains Russian territory today—isolated from the Russian mainland, but internationally recognized.

The comparison to Crimea is instructive. Both regions were once tied to a former empire, both have been militarized heavily by Russia, and both stand as testaments to the enduring consequences of wartime boundary decisions. Yet the international community has accepted Kaliningrad's status, in part because it was formalized through multilateral treaties (e.g., the Potsdam Conference), and because the defeated German state was in no position to resist.

Crimea's annexation in 2014 was rejected globally because it occurred after Ukraine had already been internationally recognized, and the process lacked transparency, legal rigor, or consent. Had Crimea's transfer to Russia occurred in 1991, through a negotiated and mutually ratified process, it might have more closely resembled Kaliningrad—a historical anomaly, but not an international scandal.

In this light, the 1991 moment represented a chance to set the terms of peaceful revision, rather than suffer the consequences of violent correction. But that moment passed. And with it, the possibility of a Crimea recognized like Kaliningrad, rather than contested like Kosovo.

7. Strategic Gains vs. Moral Costs

Any discussion of a hypothetical 1991 partition that ceded Crimea and eastern Ukraine to Russia must wrestle with the ethical implications of such a move. While the strategic advantages of early border stabilization are considerable—reduced conflict, clearer alliances, and greater national coherence—the moral costs are equally real. Ceding territory based on ethno-linguistic identity raises troubling questions about sovereignty, precedent, and the rights of minorities. It risks legitimizing the logic of imperial reach and could embolden future power plays under the guise of ethnic unity. Even in a peaceful partition, the line between geopolitical realism and

moral compromise is thin. This section evaluates whether such a tradeoff could have resulted in a lasting peace—or merely postponed a deeper reckoning.

7.1 Would Peace Have Endured Under De Facto Imperial Lines?

The central strategic argument for a 1991 partition is stability: by aligning borders more closely with identity and historical allegiance, future tensions could have been avoided. Crimea, Donbas, and Kharkiv would have joined a Russia they culturally identified with; Ukraine would have emerged smaller but more internally consistent and Western-facing. In this framework, peace would have been preserved not by suppressing grievances but by preventing the emergence of contested zones altogether.

However, such peace would rest upon de facto imperial lines—a Russia enlarged not through war, but through retention of lands associated with its imperial past. This raises a crucial question: can long-term peace be built on foundations that validate an imperial logic, even if enacted peacefully?

The answer depends on the internal governance of the annexed regions. If Russia integrated these territories with respect, investment, and civic inclusion, peace might have endured. But if these regions were treated as buffer zones or tools of geostrategic leverage, then stability would have been superficial at best. Moreover, other nations with imperial histories might have drawn inspiration, leading to a slow erosion of the post-WWII territorial consensus. Peace might have come—but at the cost of reshaping global norms.

7.2 Propaganda, Soft Power, and the New Cold Peace

Had Russia acquired Crimea and eastern Ukraine in 1991, it could have reframed its post-Soviet narrative as a successful steward of its people, rather than as a revanchist aggressor. The propaganda machine would not have needed to fabricate grievances about mistreated Russian speakers or neo-Nazi threats in Kyiv. Instead, Moscow could claim to have peacefully retained its historic lands and protected its cultural domain without bloodshed.

This narrative would have strengthened Russia's soft power—particularly among Russian-speaking minorities in other post-Soviet states. Belarus, Kazakhstan, and parts of the Baltics might have gravitated more willingly toward Moscow, believing that their identities would be safeguarded. The ideological clash with the West would still have existed, but in a more subdued register—one of civilizational divergence rather than territorial confrontation.

What emerges from this scenario is a “New Cold Peace”—a geopolitical rivalry not marked by proxy wars or invasions, but by competing spheres of influence and narrative legitimacy. Ukraine, embedded in the West, might have flourished as a democratic experiment. Russia, emboldened by an early strategic win, might have focused more on internal modernization and Eurasian integration than territorial disruption. In this configuration, competition replaces conflict—and stability, while imperfect, becomes sustainable.

7.3 Risk of Long-Term Insurgency or Cultural Repression

Even if borders were peacefully adjusted in 1991, this does not guarantee that all inhabitants of the transferred territories would have accepted their new national identity without resistance. While majorities in Crimea and Donbas were pro-Russian, minorities—such as Crimean Tatars, pro-Ukrainian speakers, and dissenting youth—might have rejected annexation and organized against it. If Russia failed to protect their rights or attempted forced assimilation, long-term unrest could have followed.

A key risk would be the subtle repression of minority cultures. Language laws, political marginalization, or the suppression of local civil society groups could generate resentment and underground resistance. Even in the absence of full-scale insurgency, these dynamics would poison the legitimacy of Russian rule in the annexed regions. Crimea’s Crimean Tatar population, for instance, had already experienced Soviet-era deportations and would likely have viewed any renewed Russian control with suspicion.

On the other side, Ukraine might also have experienced moral injury from conceding lands it regarded as integral. The loss of Crimea and Donbas could have seeded an irredentist counter-narrative in Ukrainian politics, fueling nationalism and calls for reunification over time. If unresolved, such sentiments could resurface in moments of weakness or crisis—risking future conflict.

In short, even a peaceful partition in 1991 would not have erased the underlying tensions. Without robust legal protections, cultural autonomy, and economic integration, both Russia and Ukraine would risk cultivating smoldering resentments beneath the surface of apparent stability. Peace, in such a scenario, would not be guaranteed—it would require careful, continuous effort to maintain.

8. A More Stable Post-Soviet Order?

Was the world right to preserve Ukraine’s borders in 1991, or did that decision sow the seeds of later tragedy? This counterfactual analysis suggests that a carefully negotiated, demographically

justified partition at the outset of independence could have averted some of the most destabilizing events of the 21st century—most notably the annexation of Crimea, the war in Donbas, and the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Yet this hypothetical peace would not have come without its own costs and ambiguities. While a 1991 partition might have prevented kinetic conflict in the short term, it may also have introduced new sources of resentment, ambition, and rivalry. The question is not whether the alternate path would have been perfect, but whether it would have produced a more stable and durable geopolitical equilibrium. This section weighs the avoided catastrophes against the risks that would likely have endured.

8.1 Partition as Prevention: What Conflict Was Avoided

The most obvious benefit of a 1991 partition would have been the avoidance of two major wars—the 2014 hybrid war in eastern Ukraine and the 2022 full-scale invasion. Both of these conflicts were rationalized by Russia as responses to perceived threats against Russian-speaking populations in Crimea and Donbas. Had those territories never been part of post-Soviet Ukraine, Russia would have lacked a credible pretext for intervention. The immense human toll—hundreds of thousands of deaths, millions of refugees, and widespread urban destruction—could have been entirely avoided.

Further, the political polarization inside Ukraine that led to cycles of protest, revolution, and instability would likely have been mitigated. Without a powerful eastern bloc of voters pushing pro-Russian parties into national power, Ukraine would have developed a more stable, Euro-Atlantic political identity. There would have been no Yanukovych presidency, no Euromaidan uprising, and no subsequent secessionist crisis.

On the global stage, NATO would have expanded eastward without the persistent anxiety of triggering Russian aggression in contested areas. A Ukraine that did not contain Russian-claimed regions could have joined the alliance in the early 2000s—altering deterrence dynamics in ways that discouraged escalation. In this version of history, the West and Russia still compete, but do so on **cleaner terms**, without the entanglement of ambiguous borders and disputed loyalties.

8.2 Partition as Provocation: What Tensions Remain

Despite these gains, a 1991 partition would not have resolved all geopolitical tension. In fact, it might have provoked new anxieties and rivalries, albeit along different lines. A truncated Ukraine may have harbored deep resentment toward Russia, viewing the territorial loss not as logical separation, but as theft. Over time, this sentiment could have solidified into a Ukrainian

irredentism, with future governments refusing to recognize the legitimacy of the Russian annexation.

This moral and symbolic grievance might have become a permanent feature of Ukrainian nationalism, potentially creating friction with Western allies and complicating integration into NATO or the EU. The West, for its part, might have found itself torn between recognizing the geopolitical logic of the partition and defending the principle of sovereign equality—especially if future Russian leaders used their 1991 gain to assert hegemony over other post-Soviet states.

Russia, emboldened by a peaceful expansion, could also have been tempted to test the limits of this success elsewhere. If the 1991 partition was interpreted as a reward for ethnic alignment, Moscow might have turned its attention to northern Kazakhstan, Transnistria, or the Baltic states—each with significant Russian-speaking populations. Rather than pacifying Russian ambitions, early success could have fueled a new pattern of "quiet expansion", cloaked in legalism but driven by imperial instinct.

8.3 Evaluating Alternate Peace: Better, Worse, or Just Different?

The answer to whether this alternate peace would have been "better" depends on how one weighs stability against principle, and violence prevention against moral precedent. On one hand, the historical costs of preserving Ukraine's Soviet-era borders are immense: war, displacement, energy crises, and the re-militarization of Europe. On the other hand, a partition—however bloodless—would have validated the idea that large powers can redraw boundaries based on cultural or historical claims.

From a realist perspective, the alternate history offers a more stable and predictable regional order. Territorial lines would better reflect identity, major conflicts would have been avoided, and political alliances could have formed without constant fear of escalation. But from a liberal-internationalist standpoint, it risks legitimizing geopolitical revisionism through the back door—setting a precedent that other states might exploit to justify ethnic partition or annexation.

Ultimately, the partition would not have been simply better or worse—it would have been structurally different. The same East-West rivalry would persist, but without the smoldering fuse of Ukrainian territorial ambiguity. Russia and the West might still distrust one another, but with fewer opportunities for direct confrontation. Ukraine might still struggle economically, but its political development would be more coherent. This version of peace would have traded idealism for equilibrium—not a triumph of justice, but a containment of disaster. Whether that trade was worth making remains an open—and haunting—question.

9. Conclusion: History as Design Space

The 1991 partition of Ukraine never happened. Yet in imagining that it did, we gain a deeper understanding of the forces that have shaped, and continue to shape, Eurasian geopolitics. The exercise is not merely speculative; it is diagnostic. Counterfactual history reveals the extent to which borders—often treated as sacred—are in fact contingent, negotiated, and sometimes perilously improvised. In the aftermath of the Soviet Union's collapse, the world chose continuity over correction, prioritizing stability over demographic alignment. That choice brought with it decades of mounting contradiction—culminating in annexation, war, and global rupture.

This conclusion draws together the key insights from the analysis, emphasizing how counterfactual reflection is not a denial of reality but a discipline of design—one that recognizes historical choices as blueprints, with multiple branches and breakpoints. Understanding what might have been helps clarify what must be navigated now.

9.1 The Contingency of National Borders

The borders we inherit are not immutable truths of geography or destiny—they are artifacts of human decision, compromise, and inertia. Ukraine's 1991 boundaries were not the product of plebiscites, demographic study, or national consensus. They were administrative lines drawn for the purposes of central planning within the USSR, hastily converted into sovereign frontiers under international law.

The failure to adjust these lines at the moment of independence created a fragile architecture—one that preserved outward unity while concealing deep internal divisions. Crimea and Donbas were not "lost" in the 2010s; they were never fully integrated to begin with. The contingency of these borders calls for humility in geopolitics: what is treated as natural or inviolable is often neither. Recognizing this does not mean endorsing revisionism—but it does mean acknowledging that durable peace requires more than cartographic habit.

9.2 Learning from Unrealized Scenarios

Counterfactual thinking is often dismissed as academic indulgence, but in fact, it serves a critical strategic function. It enables policymakers, historians, and citizens to interrogate assumptions, stress-test outcomes, and imagine futures not dictated solely by precedent. The scenario of a 1991 partition is not offered to rewrite history, but to understand the decisions that went unmade—and the consequences that followed.

By exploring what might have occurred if Russia had retained its culturally aligned territories from the outset, we see that the wars of 2014 and 2022 were not inevitable. Nor was the prolonged limbo of Ukrainian geopolitical identity. The missed opportunity to align borders with cultural reality—and to do so peacefully—was a design failure, not a historical law.

In this sense, counterfactuals are not about nostalgia. They are tools of diagnostic hindsight, revealing that much of what we call destiny is, in fact, design. And by studying designs that were rejected or never attempted, we become more capable of constructing sustainable architectures in the future.

9.3 Implications for Future Border Conflicts

The implications of this analysis extend beyond Ukraine. Across the globe, there are regions where borders do not align with identity, where minorities live under states they did not choose, and where historical grievances simmer just beneath the surface. Taiwan, Kashmir, Kurdistan, Palestine, and the Caucasus are only the most visible examples. Each presents its own configuration of history, demographics, and power—but they all share the same underlying tension between legal borders and lived realities.

The lesson of the 1991 Ukrainian scenario is that early intervention—rooted in negotiation, legality, and cultural recognition—may be the only viable alternative to later catastrophe. Where peaceful partition is not possible, genuine federalism, minority protections, and autonomy agreements must be pursued with urgency and creativity. The longer a mismatch between identity and territory is left unresolved, the more likely it is to erupt under the pressure of populism, external manipulation, or state failure.

History, therefore, must be treated not only as a record of what happened, but as a design space of what was possible—and what may yet be. In doing so, we move from being prisoners of inherited maps to stewards of evolving orders. And in a century where the friction between borders and belonging is only increasing, such stewardship may be the only path toward peace.

10. References

This bibliography compiles essential works and data sources that inform the historical context, theoretical frameworks, and geopolitical insights explored throughout the paper. The materials span academic research, primary government documents, international legal frameworks, and authoritative demographic studies. While the 1991 partition of Ukraine is a counterfactual scenario, the following references offer real-world grounding for the arguments made.

Post-Soviet State Formation and Border Legacy

- Beissinger, Mark R. *Nationalist Mobilization and the Collapse of the Soviet State*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Suny, Ronald Grigor. *The Revenge of the Past: Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of the Soviet Union*. Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Hale, Henry E. *The Foundations of Ethnic Politics: Separatism of States and Nations in Eurasia and the World*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Kolstø, Pål. "The Sustainability and Future of Unrecognized Quasi-States." *Journal of Peace Research* 43(6): 723–740, 2006.

Demographic and Linguistic Data (Ukraine, 1991–2014)

- Ukrainian Census (2001). *State Statistics Committee of Ukraine*.
- Wilson, Andrew. *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*. Yale University Press, 2000.
- Barrington, Lowell. "Russian-Speakers in Ukraine and Kazakhstan: 'Nationality,' 'Population,' or 'Language Group'?" *Post-Soviet Affairs* 17(2): 129–158, 2001.
- International Crisis Group. *Ukraine: Running out of Time*. Europe Report No. 231, 2014.

Crimea, Donbas, and Regional Identity

- Sasse, Gwendolyn. *The Crimea Question: Identity, Transition, and Conflict*. Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Kulyk, Volodymyr. "Language Identity, Linguistic Diversity and Political Cleavages: Evidence from Ukraine." *Nations and Nationalism* 17(3): 627–648, 2011.

- Kuzio, Taras. “Identity and Nation-Building in Ukraine: Defining the ‘Other.’” *Ethnicities* 1(3): 343–365, 2001.

NATO Expansion and Strategic Doctrine

- Asmus, Ronald D. *Opening NATO's Door: How the Alliance Remade Itself for a New Era*. Columbia University Press, 2002.
- Goldgeier, James M. *Not Whether But When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO*. Brookings Institution Press, 1999.
- North Atlantic Treaty Organization. *NATO Enlargement: 1999–2004*. NATO Archives, Brussels.
- Mearsheimer, John J. “Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West’s Fault.” *Foreign Affairs* 93(5): 77–89, 2014.

International Law, Sovereignty, and Partition Precedents

- Cassese, Antonio. *Self-Determination of Peoples: A Legal Reappraisal*. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Crawford, James. *The Creation of States in International Law*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- International Court of Justice. *Accordance with International Law of the Unilateral Declaration of Independence in Respect of Kosovo*. Advisory Opinion, July 22, 2010.
- United Nations. *Charter of the United Nations*, 1945, Articles 1–2, 51.
- OSCE. *The Helsinki Final Act*, 1975. Section I: “Sovereign Equality, Respect for the Rights Inherent in Sovereignty.”

Contemporary Geopolitical Analysis and Strategic Forecasting

- Trenin, Dmitri. *Post-Imperium: A Eurasian Story*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2011.
- Hill, Fiona & Gaddy, Clifford. *Mr. Putin: Operative in the Kremlin*. Brookings Institution Press, 2015.

- Menon, Rajan & Rumer, Eugene. *Conflict in Ukraine: The Unwinding of the Post–Cold War Order*. MIT Press, 2015.
- Kaplan, Robert D. *The Revenge of Geography*. Random House, 2012.
- Snyder, Timothy. *The Road to Unfreedom: Russia, Europe, America*. Tim Duggan Books, 2018.

Methodology and Counterfactual Theory

- Tetlock, Philip E. & Belkin, Aaron (Eds). *Counterfactual Thought Experiments in World Politics: Logical, Methodological, and Psychological Perspectives*. Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Ferguson, Niall. *Virtual History: Alternatives and Counterfactuals*. Basic Books, 1999.
- Lebow, Richard Ned. *Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations*. Princeton University Press, 2010.

The author has published ~ 5,000 AI-assisted papers at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.